37 66-99

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. (1897-98) 191 (L R)

File No. 70-99

Serial Nos. 1-18

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-18

~~Part~~ B for September 1902

SUBJECT.

Rejection of the appeal of Rama Rao for the Patell office of Mulbagal Kasaba. Kolar Dt.

W D 1250—GPE—60,000—22-1-18

Index &c

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 2. of 1902.

Appellant.	Respondent.
Rama Rao	Lachanna

Appeal against order of the Asst. Commr. Kolar Dist. appointing the Respondent as the Patel of Mullagal.

Date of hearing 28.8.02
Notice issued on 7.8.02
not served.

Appellant
Peon Rameswar in case
Counter Resp. Reddi
in person.

for Commr
29/8/02
Submitted to the 1st Cr.

Ckll
29.8.02

It has already been held twice that the appeal is barred by time and Govt decline to reentertain it. Govt however note that the Petitioners claim preferred in 1889 has been rejected. Summarily also such claims are ~~in the Petition~~ ~~Suits~~ triable in a formal manner. The claim will not be inquired into ~~by the Petitioners~~ in a ~~Petition~~ ~~Suit~~ and the Case disposed of according to the above said order for formal inquiry

Rd. 29/8/02
406

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—7-7-99.—302.

Mit Gruß

Ihr Jaschanowsky

29ten August 1902

Ergebenst

29/1902

270-97

897

Name of Petitioner: Ramalan... and Nakkadar & Sinka...

Village: Mulabagal

Taluk:

District: Kolar

Date of Arzi: 24 · 5 · 97

Date of Receipt: 27 · 97

Date of Disposal:

No. of Enclosure: Two

Abstract: Translation

...a petn presented to the Dy-C... ...regarding the Patels (... Mulabagal) Sirdr's No 5 & 14 ... ...ees granted stating that the ... ...es divisd & during the ti... ...the late Dy Commr, he com... ...d interfere in the matter. He ...ld report with a copy of the ...ate Dy Commr's Order is enclo...

The Patels of the following ... ...ages were held ... ...ed on the Nakkadars ... ...ed respectively ... ...ing the duties of the Pat... ...l 58 & that he turned ... ...to become a tenderer ... ...balance of outstandings due by ... ...villages of Mulabagal, Sidlaghe... ...and Kattakanya...

...referred to the ... ...by the Translator ... ...to the Head of the Depart... ...Yours etc Ref...

...Note of the Peon ... ...to serve the order ... ...Ref 5 ... ...produced. ...

...Sd/- 5/6/97

...Sd/- 5/6/97

...Order Sheet No 315 ... ...3-14-5 ... ...copies of the accounts.

...from ... ...as ... (R... 93).

5/6/97.

...

Order Sheet No 315 & 20-11-91

Petn of R-3+3 73-

d Pattapara of which he was
pal from the year 1888, was
ut, but as the were also
e Registers could not be
ced the parties produced
ipts of the amounts alleged
have been misappropriated by
n. Moreover there was no absolute
y to ascertain whether these receipts
e true or fabricated, whereupon
was finally arranged that the
of Rupees 1413 - 14 - 3 had been
misappropriated by the said Ve
was remitted in persuance
Madras C.P. No 515 dt 20th Nov: 1891
ered at the caution of Govt
Venkatarangiah who became
ne and left the place has no
le income, but has only one
ughter. I am the son of Venkatay
an elder brother. As my father
Narayya had similarly turned
ed and as I was then a min
was not possible to prefer this
plaint at the time and to
ecute the document legally di
In disposing of the ot
tals and Sandages who similar
appropriated Govt money in t
lurs, the misappropriated amount w
overed from the persons who
re appointed to those offices, b
was done in the case of Kadiya
ayyakkasi Guttahalli, Sunnapaya
rakuru and other village
ls being the case the amount
due from my uncle Venkata
1413 - 14 - 3 was not recovered fr
officials and the office has
n given free to me who has no

Kankindasi.

Habibullah. When notices were served by the Sub Builder regarding the ~~not~~ receipts for the Revised Limited amount, to the parties from whom the amount was alleged to be due, the receipts were not produced at the time, but fabricated receipts were produced during the time of the hearing before the Asst. Collr. from ~~before~~ the Asst. Collr. Copy of the notices sent to the Sub Inspectors by Sub Collr. Nandida Range who was a local enquiry at the time. This Copy is with the file in the A.C. office and may be perused.

I agree to pay Rs 700/= every half the amount of Rs 1618-11-3 alleged to be misappropriated. ~~by~~ This Rs 700/= is in Cash, and the rest may be received from the Photos and ~~Copies~~ about 10% of the Title Villages referred to above, by paying only half the amount for my maintenance, the other half being withheld by Govt. I shall maintain me from

from half the fifty amount that would be granted to me and the amount realized from my other lands and get on with the Govt. work without giving room for any complaint. Therefore I now pray that the Govt. may be pleased to ~~grant~~ confer the appointment on me, a legal Habitandar, instead of planting it free and without any remuneration to them.

If the ~~amount~~ misappropriation alleged to have commenced from the Dhatu year is true, the Inundation officers, year after year, would not have allowed the matter to lie over without striking the balance due from each individual. Why such a balance was not struck is a matter for the consideration of the Govt. The fabricated receipt produced during the ignorance of the parties, might have been the cause of the alleged misappropriation This is corroborated by the Amildar's Inji. If such a large amount had been misappropriated, it would have been let off without

inquiry

inquiry then and there.
I request that the Court may be pleased to consider these points. I will remit the amount as stated above. I pray that the Petition to which I am the Respondent, may be Conferred on me.

Endorsement

14.5.97

① Cert. 1st 5-9, Printed to date by the Registrar Kolar Dt.

As this Petition case has disposed of during the time of the late Registrar, I cannot interfere with it now. The Petn is therefore returned.

② Authenticated copy of the detail list of the Amounts misappropriated by Pet. Certificate.

C.R.

3/6/97.

The Decree was requested to report on 2 points (1) Was the pet. a party before the

Dy Comm (when Pachamia
was appointed patel) (2).
Does the plea of minority
avail him now?

The Dy Comm[r] reports that
the pet[r] presented 2 pet[ns]
to the Dy Comm[r] in 1889 claiming the patili
& that these pet[ns] were
rejected. & that pet[r]
was 19 years old in 1889

Thus the case having
been decided so long ago
as 1889 against the pet[r]
the plea of minority
not availing, the pet[n]
is [illegible] out of time
by nearly 6 years.

There are [illegible] x reps in the
Rev Branch to show that
the pet[r]'s uncle misappropriated
large sums of money of which
Rs 1508-11-4 has to be
written off as irrecoverable

4/10/98

x Perhaps when the pet[r]
was sub[e] but
since ret[d]

COURT FEE

EIGHT ANNAS

COURT FEE

EIGHT ANNAS

COURT FEE

EIGHT ANNAS

DEWAN'S OFFICE

BK
4/9/97

SR 7091-2

1897 (2)

No. 6610.

Name of Petitioner Ram Rao Patil.

Village Kaxxalia Inulbag

Taluk Inulbag-al

District Ko-Lar.

Date of Arzi 26 August 97

Date of Receipt 1st September 97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosures Three.

ABSTRACT.

Submits for information of the Inamdar amendment No. 531 dated 16.2.91 created in this Office endorsement No. 346 dtd 24.6.97.—

Authenticated copy of Deputy Commissioner's order No. 531, is as follows

It has been reported that Patil has done his duties satisfactorily, he has been confirmed as Patil

96 Enam petition

Arzi dated 26-8-97 received 1-9-97

Kaira 4/9/97.

Petition with enclosures

Judi Inam. 3648 of 24-8-97 & rec'd 26-8-97

(1) Inam Register & Village Officer's Appointment

(2) Revenue Officer's Report of 6-8-97.

(3) Mamlatdar's Confirmation of 7th Jamabandi Endorsement No. 8315/16/2/91

BK 24/9/97

Petitioner explains the delay & must return in appeal against the Collr's Order dt 20/10/97

Endorsed on the petition

BKm

2/10/97

22-10-97

Valid and the same
have also been corrected
and returned for
its being duly executed
and delivered by the
individual concerned.

CA

3/19/97

No. 661

66102

24 OCT. 97

By Order

Reference 4/11/97 — papers sent to the Rev. Board 10-1-98.

661 of 97 and the Rev. file No. 34 of 93.

4-11 — Office put up — Submitted

5/11/97 — 6th 11/97

1) Stamp supplied
2) out of time by about 5 years & 3 months — explained by petr as due to his minority.
3) Appeal against the Depy. Commr's order registering one Puttamma as patil of Mulbagal Kasba & ignoring the claims of petr who is the nephew of the deceased patel Venkatarayappa
4) Consultation

Kindly have any of serial No 45 & serial No 47 (office file) it appears that Venkatarayappa misappropriated very large sum of money of which Rs 1508-13-4 had to be written off as irrecoverable.

... 62nd ...

15/11/97

Rd 7 P.m. 15. 11. 97.

LR 70-97-3

(3)

1897

No. 1160 L A.S. No. 42 97-98

Name of Petitioner Rama Rao

Village Mulbagal Kasba

Taluk

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 23-10-97

Date of Receipt 30-10-97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT.

With reference to Endt No. 661 dated 21-10-97 issued from this office asking the petitioner to explain delay of more than 5 years after the decision of the D. Commr. states that he was under the disability to appeal being a minor, which point he had noted in the

3rd para of his appeal petition — that consequently he has appealed against that order after he attained majority —

Prays that the words be perused and proper orders passed

8/11/17

Received Dft-D
1-11-97

No. 1116

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
RECD. NO. 1116
1-11-97

Pol. 756 P. (4)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petitions
Registered No.s 3448 dated 24-8-97 and
66 and
23-10-97 respectively, 116
received at the Dewan's Office from
Ranna Rao, of Mulbagal
taluka, appealing against the
order of the Dy Comr, Kolar dt
directing the registry of
the Patel of Mulbagal in the
name of one Patchamuda in
preference to that of the petr who
is the nephew of the dismissed
Patel is forwarded, together with its Mein three
are
enclosures to the Deputy Commissioner
of the Kolar District,
for disposal. Submission of a
report as to whether the petr
was a party before the Dy Comr
and if so by whom represented,
and whether the plea of minority
avail him sufficiently so as to
interrupt the flow of the
period of limitation.
2. The petitions with the
enclosures should be returned.

By order,

By order
Secretary.
for Secretary

BANGALORE,
18/11/97
20/ 189

17-12-97

L(R) 977-5

Gen. 31.]

119

5

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 2117
SEP 20 1898
Ser. 137
DIWAN'S OFFICE

Subd 6th Councillor Gen
& Rlwys Septr No 3448

14/10/98

9986

In practice an in the Office note and on this report of the Office, but was a mere when the case was papers sent here and the report that is time barred and cannot be entertained. Hence there is rejection.

Return any other papers sent by you

Rly Rec

Encl papers

Rly 15/10/98

From The Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Revenue and General Depts.

Dated 18th
Despatched 19th } September 1898.
Received

General No. 1227 } 1898-99
No. 338

Enclosure No. Records

Submitting a report as called for as to whether Ramadeva Anibagal was a party before the Government for the Patelship of Anibagal and whether the idea of minority put forward by him is of any avail to him now so as to interrupt the flow of limitation

Rev Petition

20/9

Red 22/9

Refs papers sent

22/9/98

23/9/98 Mly

Kolar District,
Deputy Commissioner's Office

No. 1227/338 Rev. Records

Dated, Camp Kolar, the 18th September 1894

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your official memorandum No. Pet/756, dated the 18th December 1893, calling for a report as to whether Ramadas of Mulbagal was a party before the Deputy Commissioner to the Patéship of Mulbagal and whether the plea of minority put forward by him is of any avail to him now so as to interrupt the flow of limitation, I beg to state as follows:-

2. The said Ramadas' uncle was the Patel of Mulbagal. In 1889 he disappeared, having embezzled some Government money. He was therefore dismissed and one Pachaniya was appointed Patel. The said Ramadas, the nephew of the dismissed Patel, presented two petitions to the then Deputy Commissioner (marked A and B in the file) one in the month of May 1889 and the other in June 1889. Mr. Abdul Rahman Sahib, the then Deputy Commissioner issued an order, No. 32 dated 3.8.89 (marked C) on the former petition to the Amildar to the effect that the petitioner was not entitled to the office, as he was the son of the Shanbhog of the village.

3. The Amildar's report No. 66, dated the 5th September 1894

goes

goes to show that the date of birth of the said Rama Rao is the 25th December 1870. Thus, he was about 19 years of age, when he put forward his claim for the office in 1889.

4. The vernacular correspondence on the subject as also the petitions and their enclosures received with your memo under reply are herein enclosed.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

Deputy Commissioner,

Kolar district.

(6)

No.3448-661-1116 [illegible]
3 [illegible]

[illegible] 10-10-98

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 24-5-97, 26-8-97, [illegible] 23-10-97 [illegible]

[illegible]

1889 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]70-97-6

Reference
4/11/98

1116 of 1898 Reminder Ref 8/11/98.

Ans R

Ref: petn

Adv

7/11/98 Labd.

Regd an application praying for certain relief & post marked Kolar dated 6-10-98

(1) the petn is insufficiently stamped -

MC
7/11/98

Ref: being unstamped

Undisputed

Blen
10/11 P.

Court despatched
17/11/98

Transfer 342 & 8-10-98

1898 (7)

No. 860.

Name of Petitioner Ramakka Alias Thayamma Patel Gowda of Gulbaga

Village

Taluk Gulbaga

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 16. 10. 98

Date of Receipt 19. 10. 98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 4

ABSTRACT

Revision petition of the Hakdar of the Patel of Gulbaga on the decision of the Govt as per Govt. No: 3468. dt: 1116 . 6. 10. 98 States that his case was thrown away as barred, that it has not been looked into on the merits, that the decision is against the law laid down in Sec: 6 of Chapter 5 of the Bijapur Rent Revenue Code of 1892 & circumstances that it is against the decision contained in Sir Gazetteer Vol 3 of 1884, that

it is against the Proceedings of the Govt:

No: 927-34/17 stating that if any person (Petitioner) is to be dismissed for any fault arising then the Petitioner should be guilty to persons nearest the family only, if no such heir of that man could not be found, and that the new-comer does not become a burden by the mere fact of his being appointed to the office, that the petitioner is ready to make good the deficient amount, that the Govt: loses a sum of Rs 14.00/- per month appointing him as Peon and that he is ready to present himself before the Court on a day appointed to hear his case.

Prays that he would be given a hearing and his case be entirely re-considered.

Enclosures:

1. Govt: Sanct: No: 3118 S. 65-11/5 6.10.98
2. Sanct Sanct: No 831 dt 16.2.91
3. Petition sent to the Dy: Comr: dated 6.5.97 with Dy: Comrs: Sanct: thereon

Authenticated Copy of the decision of the Dy: Comr: dt 30.11.91.

L.S.G.

1.11.98

Refa
1.4.99
865
Mark
1/4/99

Subd
(1) One Rupee Stamp affixed - Mark
(2) Application for review of Govt order
(Endt) dy 6.10.98 — in time
Mfg
3.4.99 Subd: S Lr Commr's

3/4/99

Rdy. 3.4.99

Submitted
5.4.99 11004
9 cases pd
Papers returned
Case applied for review
Lr Commr's Appeal
Case
5/4/99

Encl: Nil
CK
7/4/99

(8)

1899

No. 1588

Name of Petitioner Ramaswamy

~~Village~~ Chinnaputtur

Taluk Tiruchengodu, Salem

District Salem

Date of Arzi 21-3-99.

Date of Receipt 28-3-99.

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil.

Petn for Review of Govt order in G.O. No. 3445, 6th Oct. 1898 - on the ground that the suit is not barred by limitation as the cause of action arose within 6 years; that the Govt should consider:-
(1) 6th Column, XI Art of Ltn Act
(2) Proceedings Board of Rev. No. 5 dt. 15-5-57
(3) Order No. 43 dt 23-5-1857 issued in accordance with the Board's Proceedings No. 927-34; that no notice was taken of his many petitions to Govt, stating that he would make good the misappropriated part of the amount out of his pay; that for the above

ABSTRACT

[illegible] [illegible]
moveable & immoveable
~~forfeited~~ worth Rs 15 lacs
been forfeited to Govt;
- this case was dismissed
~~as~~ on the ground, as held
by the H. Courts, that it
was barred by limitation;
but in the case of the petn
Narasipur it was served
the heirs of the deceased
~~the~~ 20 years, before
~~which~~ which ~~had~~ ~~been~~ suffered
~~imprisonment~~ for mis-
~~appropriating~~ Govt Money
- whereas in this case it
only 6 years since the cause
action arose & he is pre
pared to pay the misappro-
priated amount

Prays for grant as above &
rendering the above services.

M.
[illegible]



1000

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 15882
28-3-95

To

The Secretary
to Govt. & Revenue Departments
Mysore Government
Bangalore

The humble petition of Rama Rao, claimant of the Patailship, Bindiganavile Taluka on the order Reg. 3248-65-11-5 dated 6-10-93, most respectfully sheweth:-

That in the above endorsement the petitioner's claim is rejected as the limitation is barred. This seems to be against the justice & procedure; for in the 6th Section XI Chapter of the Mysore Land Revenue Code 92, it will be seen that by prescription after 12 years in lieu of the lessee in fact, the claim should be restored to the descendants of the deceased (Vide Proceedings Register Vol 3 Pg 3.) Besides in the proceedings passed in favr. Rama Rao the late Devan it is clearly stated & circulated to all the Cutcherry & the effect that in case of the person be liable to be dismissed from an office, the person name admitted in place of the person in default will have entitled to inherit any right of the hereditary. If any doubt concern of the enfeoffment should be limited to a certain period & the Patailship service ought to be handed over to the deceased of the dismissed (Vide order Reg 4 3 of 23rd May 1881 issued in accordance with the Devan's Proceedings Reg 927-34 17

That under the foregoing reasons, your petitioner has every right for Patailship as it is under 12 years since the deprivation ensued; in accordance with the your petitioner have agreed to redeem finally that is of the mortgaged money out of the 14 Rs 1/- assessed the time on many occasions, no head was paid to the prayers by passing final & just orders. Without going into details of his petitions, & bearing merely on the Commissioner's order stating that as the Limitation barred, his Appeal has been refused; your petitioner cannot be notified by such orders.

That the Defaulters property to the amount of the was forfeited, movable & immoveable properties be attached & sold by the Government. Forbearing all the arrears & your petitioner entered amount only for the which has become to the Government, he submitted above Petition to the Dewan's office. He requested first of all to the

2

of Conservancy and also has been representing now & then to the Police Authorities, it is nearly 3 years since your poor petitioner began & represented his grievances to the Govt. Since these 3 years, he regret to state that none of the higher Authorities took interest in his cause & sat in sovereign. On the other hand they were only pleased to pass different Orders in different ways. Your petitioner deems, they seem to be reluctant to accept the 1400/- which has become due to the Govt. Government. If the Late Lamented H. H. Krishna Rajendra Wodeyar Bahadur be alive, your petitioner & his family who are under his protection would not have been left unexplained. Alone your poor petitioner has been an orphan.

That for the last 3 years his case has not been properly dealt with. If justice cannot be had here, what can your poor petitioner do? For the Patailship of Kadarigere was restored recently to the claimant which had been granted to the heirs of the Kandeera Rao vide Govt. the claimant's paternal father having misappropriated the Government money had also suffered 3 years' Imprisonment. Now the "Patkar" has been restored to his deserved claimant. Whereas the petitioner's cause of action has not even terminated 5 years. Now then the limitation plea to be barred in his case. Also being the Revenue Regulation suit of Village Servants petitioner ~~thinks~~ that there existing limitation for such suits is left to your Honor's discretion

Last in conclusion he beg that your Gracious Honor kindly considering the above circumstances will be so good as to pass favorable order on the matter of his claim and grant to the Patailship of Kadarigere be restoring ~~the~~ Lands sustained to the Government & proper misappropriated amount by late Patkar by affix 5 Rupees stamp & thus restore the right of Patailship to the Petitioner

And for which act of kindness, he shall as in duty bound ever pray for your Honor's long life prosperity.

That as he has not sufficient required Stamps, he now ~~attached to affix the stamps~~ affixed the stamps only upon ~~our~~ petitioner's ~~signature~~

Dated
at Ingrachally } Your Honor's most obedient & humble Servant
the 5th March 1917

Petitioner

Claimant to the Patailship of

10-4-99

(9)

Kollur

(10)

1899

No. 497

Name of Petitioner Rama Rao
patel taluk

Village } mulbagal
Taluk } Kaolar

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 15-7-99

Date of Receipt 30-8-99

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

Pet. submits that he is prepared to pay Rs 11-0-0 to Govt (the amount due) and prays that the Govt order rejecting his pet may be reconsidered and the pet restored to the position it occupied

JE 1/9/99

73 Refer put up.

Instructed - Petn to be returned

mg

4.9.99

Instructed

JE 6.9.99

Rs 11-0-0 7-9-99

7-9-99

1897-1900

No. 1598 A.No. 2004-

Name of Petitioner Rama Rau
Kulkarni Patil

Village } Anuliagai

Taluk }

District Kolar.

Date of Arzi 9-2-1900

Date of Receipt 12-2-

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Eight.

ABSTRACT

Application for re
final Suit No. 1588 of
+ Suits-001-1896 &
rejecting his appli
time-barred and
insufficient grou
petn. states that
-sive to final pro
10. 3 of September
decree
hereon charges pro
10. 22-31 to the
that taken a cri
the limitation

- village servant of whom
he has been dismissed
the service, his line or
he himself should be
restored to the office after
the expiry of 12 years, he
may be given back the
Talati Office; that his
case is not barred by
limitation because by
his horoscope (Exc I) re-
-cently found, it is seen
that he is aged only 25½ years,
& he has filed the suit
soon after he attained his
majority; that in addi-
-tion he says that he
would make good a por-
-tion of the embezzled
money & that as the
Govt has not taken into
consideration the loss of
Rs 1100 to Govt.
Prays that after perusal
of the records & hearing

Petn No. 1598 of 1899-1900.

orders
the petr in person, the
may be fined. Restore
him to the Police Office

Encl: His horoscope.
2. Petn No. 1597 of
15-12-99 to Govt. of the
Govt. Chemist.
3. Govt. Govt. No.
1588 of 7-4-99.
4. Petn of 860 of 16-12-99
to Govt. of the Govt. Chemist
5. Govt. Govt. No.
3665, 661-1116 Jo. 2-99
6. Govt. Comm. order
No. 631 of 16-2-81.
His petn of 8-5-97
to Govt. Comm. of the
Govt. Chemist.
8. Govt. Comm. order
[redacted] of 20-11-91.

Sin
7/2/1900.

The only fresh ground
put forward is that
according to the horoscope
produced the petr was
a minor in 1889 when

claimed the patch

The Dy Comr who was called upon to submit a finding regarding the age of the petr reports in his letter D 18/9/98 that the petr was born in Decr 1870

The petr ought to have produced the horoscope before the amin an over whose report the finding was submitted. The horoscope was not produced even when the 1st appl for review was made and the petr has not explained why he did not produce it at an earlier stage.

My 24/3/00

Appellant under sec 10 of the Act

My 20/7/01 Hon 9/8/01

Call for the records of the case in which the minor's age was disputed & the Magr concerned to state & post the case for hearing

Does limitation apply to cases of this kind? D in D enquire into & give a finding on the question of Boy's minority in 1889. My 15/7/1907

The Dy Com. to whom a report was called for stated that Petr. Peramakan who appeared before him (on 30-1-02) supported his assertion that he was a minor in 1889 by producing a horoscope to show that he was born in 1874 - but his service Register clearly shows his birthday as 25th Dec 1870 & that his petition was not time-barred as he appears to have agitated his claims since the year 1889.

The Dy Com. in submitting the records connected with the dismissal of Petr Perumalla Venkatarayudu from the Palakol office of Vizagapatam, states that

† 16-6-02

that no explicit order
dismissing Venkata=
=ramayya appears to
have been issued as
he absconded after
swearing Govt money
and before any action
was taken against
him — Warrant issued
for his arrest remained
unexecuted as his where=
=abouts were not known —

(12) Mad 208

24-7-1901

1900

From

THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

Rev & Genl: Depts

To

The Dy Commr
Kolar Dt

Dated

Despatched 22.7.1901
24

Received 24th

General No. 177

P.P. No. 66-99

Enclosure No.

In forwarding herewith the review petn: of no 1598 of 9.2.00 from Rama Rao Hakdar Patel of Karba Mulbagal praying for review of Govt order no 15888 of 7.6.99 rejecting his petn: as being time barred he has the honour to request that he will be so good as to submit the entire proceedings connected with the case in which the order of the petitioner was

+(together with its Enclosures for kind reference & obliging return)

was dismissed and the
buggy conveyed to a stranger,
as also also to inquire into
and submit a finding on the
question of the petitioners
minority in 1869.

Dfl. B. O

For Leg

Leg.
2/7

Remitted
Ch 20/2/01.

BF 56 g 99 Confirming R 10-97 T

aff'n putting

5-2-02

From Deputy Commissioner Kolar District

To Secretary to the Govt

10173

Dated 30-5 June 1902

Despatched

Received

General No.

C No. 1403

Enclosure No. one file

Submitting certain records in connection with the Kakarpalli of Kuraba Subbaya withdrawing the petition of Rama Rau in not time barred

Submitted with reference to the 1st order on the note to the abstract of petns Nos 1598 (Serial Nos 11)

Please note the period for hearing, but the records relating to the dismissal of the petitions have yet to be received from the Bylaws

5-6-02

Await receipt of the records

27/2/02

Rec 5-2-02 ✓

Camp Kotturu

Dated the 30th January 102

To

The Commissioner

Bellary

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith a petition addressed to the Government of Madras, praying for extra Remuneration.

2. I beg to recommend the case in which this award of the

petitioner was dismissed as being
based out in the Kalak and District
records and will be submitted shortly
3 The Vernacular papers and the
enclosures of the docket under
reference are submitted herewith.

I have the honour to
be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

F. Clem

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

(19)

1900

From

THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

To

The Deputy Commr
Kolar Dist

Dated 10th April 02

Despatched 12.

Received

General No. 1914 P

S.F. No. 66-99

Enclosure No.

With reference to his letter No. C 1403 dated 7th Inst. last, has the honor to request that he will be so good as to expedite the submission of the Vernacular records connected with the Principal of Kaniadaon made from the Taluk office of Kolar it as promised in the above

By order

Sdh

for Secretary

OFFICE OF THE
13976.
3 - MAY. 2
Rec'd 1902

1902

FROM J. E. B. Bare Sqre
Dy Commissioner
Kolar District

To
Hon'ble Narajunduppa Esqr
Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore - Revenue and
General Departmt

Dated 30th April 1902.

Despatched 1. 5. 02

Received

General No. C. 2060
No.

Enclosure No.

His No. 1914 / P.T. 66-99. date
12th april 1902.

Has the honor to
request the favour of
returning the Vernacular
records submitted with
this Office No. C. 1403-of
2nd January 1902.

They are necessary to
help in tracing out
vernacular records
connected with the
dismissal of Ramaro
Ghurde from the Patel

Put up
1.5.02
The file is with the Council Srh.
1/5.
This putup.
1/5.
Submitted with a draft
docket in reply.
7.5.02
1914-99-14

Office of Surcharge.

D. Clum

Deputy Commissioner

Kelan District

~~189~~ 1902

From

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

To

The Dy Commr & Kolar Dt.

Dated 7th

Despatched 7th May 02

Received

General No. 2069 P.
C.P. No. 66-99

Enclosure No. 1 file

~~His~~

With reference docketed No 2050 dated 30th April 1902, has the honor to return herewith the Ver Records referred to therein received with his letter No 1403 dated 30.1.02 and to request that the said records may be returned at an early date together with the records relating to the dismissal of Rama Rao's uncle from the Palegar's office Rs order

for Secretary

ail Press, Bangalore.—20-7-99.—602.

Rt copy of Confl
regd in part of

FR for 97-16

Regd. No. 975 1902
20 JUN 1902

From

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

H.V. Nanjundayya Esq:
Secretary to the Govern
ment of Mysore

Dated 16th June 1902.

Despatched 19th

Received

General No. C. 2567
No.

Enclosure No. 2 file of V.P.

Subject Vernacular records connected with the dismissal of Rama Krishnaiah from the Cadeli office of Mulbagal

Peli
20.6.02

All
20.6.02

Submitted with enclosures contained

25.6.02

This has been posted for hearing: send to Committee clerk for prep[n] of a precis & for posting on 1st [illegible] date in August

2.6.7.02

No. F. 2567

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's Office
Camp Chandragiri Post
16th June 1902

From,

J. E. G. Carr Esqre
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To,

M. V. Vanjundayya Esqr
Secretary to the Government of
Mysore — Revenue and Forest
Department. —

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 1511/7.66-99 dated 11th April 1902, requesting the submission of the vernacular records connected with the dismissal of Rama Rowmele from the Patel Office of Kilchajal, I have the honor to state that no explicit orders direct[illegible] regarding Venkata-rayappa, uncle of the petitioner, appear to have been issued as he absconded after embezzling Government money and before any action was taken against him. — Warrants issued for his arrest remained unexecuted as his whereabouts were not known. —

Correspondence ending with the Guildal's docket No. 192 dated June 1902 with the file of papers herewith submitted as also the vernacular records received with your docket No. 2069/7.66-99 dated 7th May 1902.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

J. E. G. Carr
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

(19)

Before the Court of H.H. the
Maharaja Appajirao

—o—

Present

V.P. Madhavarao Esqr. B.A.
&
C. Sreenivasayya Esqr.

Appeal No 2 of 1207-02

Petitioner: Complt-Petr
Ramachar — Pachamma

Subject

Second application for review
of Civil Suit No 3443-661-1106
F. 10-12-29 rejecting as out of
time the petitioners appeal against the
order of the Dy Commr
Kolar dtd [illegible], appointing the
complt-Petr as Patel of
Mulbagal Kasba

Date of the case.

Venkatarayappa alias No
was appointed Patel of
Mulbagal in 1874, embezzled
Govt money and absconded
in 1889. The petr who is
the nephew (brother's son)
of Venkatarayappa, presented
two petns to the Dy Commr
one on 2-5-89 and the
other on 30-6-89 promising
to make good the amount
embezzled by his uncle
and praying for the

Rejd 24/9/02
442

Copies &
12/9/02

Dismd for the appt & the 1st & 2nd counter affdvts

19/9/02

12/9

Bring up end-

the registry of the Patent office
in his name. The Privy
Council declined to grant
the petitioner's prayer remarking
that he was the son of the
Shambilay of the place
and ascertained the complete
age to be 18. The petr appealed
to Court in 1897 against
the above order and this appeal
was rejected on the ground
that the petition was long
out of time, as he must
have been born in 1879 and not
therefore a minor in 1889.
His review appln was also
similarly rejected in 1899.
In the present appln, the
petr urges that he was
a minor in 1889, having
been born in 1874 and not
in 1870 and produces a
horoscope in support of
the allegation

Decision

It has already been
held twice that the appeal
is barred by time and

Govt declines to entertain it. Govt however note that the petrs claim preferred in 1889 has been rejected summarily although such claims are treated in a formal manner. The claim will now be inquired into according to the procedure laid down for formal inquiries and the case disposed of on its merits

No 441 of 1899 dated 19.9.1902
Copy forwarded to the Dy Comm Kolar for information with the records received with his letter No C. 253 of 16-9-02

Draft

Secretary

gnu

11/9/02

Pressed copy put up 23/9

sent 23/9/902

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

PRESENT:

V. P. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., C.I.E.,

AND

C. SREENIVASIENGAR, Esq.

Appeal No. 2 of 1901-02.

Petitioner	*versus*	Counter-petitioner
Rama Rao		Pachamiya.

Subject.

Second application for review of Government endorsement No. 3418-661—1116, dated 6th October 1898, rejecting as out of time the petitioner's appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, appointing the counter-petitioner as patel of Mulbagal kasaba.

Facts of the Case.

Venkatrayappa who was appointed patel of Mulbagal in 1874, embezzled Government money and absconded in 1889. The petitioner who is the nephew (brother's son) of Venkatrayappa presented two petitions to the Deputy Commissioner, one on 2nd May 1889 and the other on 30th June 1889, promising to make good the amount embezzled by his uncle and praying for the registry of the pateli office in his name. The Deputy Commissioner declined to grant the petitioner's prayer, remarking that he was the son of the shanbhog of the place and appointed the counter-petitioner as patel. The petitioner appealed to Government in 1897 against the above order and this appeal was rejected on the ground that it was long out of time, as he was born in 1870 and was therefore a major in 1889. His review application was also similarly rejected in 1899. In the present application, the petitioner urges that he was a minor in 1889, having been born in 1874 and not in 1870 and produces a horoscope in support of the allegation.

Decision.

It has already been held twice that the appeal is barred by time. Government decline to re-entertain it. Government, however, note that the petitioner's claim preferred in 1889, has been rejected summarily although such claims are triable in a formal manner. The claim will now be enquired into according to the procedure laid down for formal enquiries and the case disposed of on its merits.

No. 441—P. F. 66-99, DATED BANGALORE, 19TH SEPTEMBER 1902.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, together with the records received with his letter No. C. 2567, dated 16th June 1902.

H. V. NANJUNDAYYA,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

Exd.—G.S.

1902-03

GOVERNMENTOF MYSORE

PETITION

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 19th September 1902

No. 441
P.F. 66-99

Requesting the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, to enquire into the claim of Rama Rao to the pateli office of Mulbagal kasaba, according to the procedure laid down for formal enquiries and to dispose of the same on its merits.

SBP—22-10-02—200

(18)

[illegible] 1593 [illegible] 6 [illegible]

[illegible]

1870-97-18

[illegible]

[illegible] 3448-661-1116 [illegible]
6-10-98 [illegible]
1588 [illegible] 7-4-99 [illegible]
61 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1598 [illegible]
9-2-1900 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

Hon. Secretary

Hon. Secretary

Hon. Secretary